

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

HAKIM JIGGETTS,

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT SCI PHOENIX, *et al.*,

Respondents.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 19-1263

ORDER

AND NOW, this 9th day of March 2022, upon consideration of Petitioner's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment [Doc. No. 31], the Respondents' response thereto, and Petitioner's reply, and for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Petitioner's "Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment" [Doc. No. 31] is **DENIED**.
2. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.¹
3. Petitioner's "Motion to Strike Response" [Doc. No. 36] is **DENIED**.²

It is so **ORDERED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Cynthia M. Rufe

CYNTHIA M. RUFÉ, J.

¹ For the reasons presented in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, there is no basis for concluding that "reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (internal citation omitted).

² Although styled as a motion to strike the Response [Doc. No. 35], the substance of this filing constitutes a reply brief. As the Court interprets *pro se* filings liberally, the Court considered the facts and arguments presented in this filing in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion as though Petitioner had filed a reply brief.